

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Lucretius IV. 741

A. Palmer

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 1-2 / February 1894, pp 29 - 29

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187244, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187244

How to cite this article:

A. Palmer (1894). Lucretius IV. 741. The Classical Review, 8, pp 29-29 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187244

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

εἰσίδου 'where none should see' (ubi nemo videret) precisely parallel? No doubt in this particular case we *may* speak of purpose—i.e. of a special kind of futurity; but if we call εἰσίδου final, it is an anomaly; if we call it simply prospective, it is quite normal, the only peculiarity being in the word by which the clause is introduced (ἐνθα instead of a relative of time).¹ In a word I regard ἐνθα μὴ τις εἰσίδου as precisely parallel to Hor. Od. iii. 3. 41 f. *ubi mutaret*

¹ Are we not in danger of exaggerating the differences between the various kinds of subordinate classes, under the influence of the classifications current in our grammars?—Still I should be very glad if anyone would direct my attention to a really representative collection of subordinate clauses introduced by Relatives of *Place*.

...et demeret—the text of my previous paper.

I am far from intending to deny that in the Interrogative-Deliberative construction there are models on which some of the cases recently discussed may have been based.² My contention simply is that the prospective use of the Subj. and Optat. may also have served as a model, and that it is especially well adapted to explain cases like Trach. 903, which both Mr. Sidgwick and Mr. Pearson find puzzling.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

² e.g. cases like εἴτ' οὖν ὅπως Ἀλκίσις ἐς γῆρας μέλοι; Eur. Alc. 52 (cf. 113—117), where the Optat. stands *in present time*. These seem to come from Direct Deliberative Questions like ποῖ τις φύγοι; = quo fugiat? (not quo fugeret?)

VALERIUS FLACCUS III. 20.

I hope Mr. Bury's paper in *Hermathena* will lead to the termination of the neglect which has befallen the text of this author—the second of Rome's surviving epic poets. I offer the following slight correction of iii. 20—

Dindyma sanguineis famulum bacchata
lacertis.

Read *catervis*. There may be some reminiscence of *laceris* in *lacertis*.

A. PALMER.

LUCRETII IV. 741.

Verum ubi equi atque hominis casu convenit imago.

The elision of the iambic word *equi* before *atque* is very strongly objected to by Lachmann, who transposes *casu*. I have no doubt that the elision is illegitimate, but an easier correction is suggested by the first line of the *Ars Poetica*. I propose:

Verum ubi *equina* hominis casu convenit
imago.

This is very like

Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
Iungere si velit.

A. PALMER.

CHASE ON THE OLD SYRIAC ELEMENT IN THE TEXT OF THE CODEX BEZAE.

The Old Syriac Element in the Text of the Codex Bezae. By FREDERIC HENRY CHASE, B.D., Lecturer in Theology at Christ's College and Principal of the Clergy Training School, Cambridge. London, Macmillan and Co., and New York. 1893. 7s. 6d. net.

MR. CHASE'S theory is that the peculiarities of Codex Bezae are due to the influence

of an Old Syriac Version, of which he holds it is to some extent a translation, this Version having been frequently interpolated and not seldom misunderstood or misread by the Greek copyist. The theory would be for some reasons attractive if there existed any other clue to this Old Syriac Version; but when we have to construct the Syriac text for ourselves and then to account for the readings of D by some error or misunder-